



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

business meeting was called only a few faithful friends responded. Miss Andrus of Seattle, filled the position of secretary left vacant by the resignation of Miss Mary Douglas of St. Louis. After the reading of the minutes, the secretary read the report of Miss Esther Strauss of Cincinnati, who had been appointed the previous year to investigate the organization of other sections, to see if an Executive board were necessary, and to provide for a succession in office. Miss Strauss recommended one of the following methods:

1. Creation of the office of vice-chairman.
2. Creation of standing committees.

An amendment to the constitution was voted, providing for the election of a vice-chairman. The committee on nominations reported and Miss Mary de Bure McCurdy,

supervisor of work with schools, Carnegie Library, Pittsburgh, was elected chairman, and Miss Adeline Zachert, director of children's work, Louisville free public library, secretary.

An exhibit of books prepared for the Section by the children's department of the Carnegie library of Pittsburgh was very helpful. It consisted of three parts:

Exhibit A: Mediocre and harmful books for children.

Included under this head were the Nickel Libraries, Alger, Castlemon, the Elsie books, Optic, Outcault, and others.

Exhibit B: Some good popular books which may take the place of mediocre and harmful fiction.

Exhibit C: Editions of some classic and standard books for children.

## COLLEGE AND REFERENCE SECTION

The College and reference section was called to order by Mr. J. C. Rowell, librarian of the University of California. Miss Julia Steffa, librarian of Pomona college library, was appointed secretary.

The first paper on "Some problems in book numbers" by H. RALPH MEAD, of the University of California library, was read by Mr. G. T. Little of Bowdoin college library.

### SOME PROBLEMS IN BOOK NUMBERS

Book numbers are used to differentiate individual books of the same class. The class number indicates the subject. Copy numbers are usually added to distinguish duplicates and volume numbers to distinguish volumes of the same work. The combination of class number and book number forms the call number for a specific book. To be of practical use in procuring books from the shelves and in manipulating library records, the call number needs to be as concise and simple as possible. The book number depends a great deal upon the system of classification and the minuteness of classification. So, although it is not likely that

any two libraries will have a uniform method of assigning book numbers, still the fundamental points can be compared. As a basis for such comparison the scheme of book numbering, as used in the University of California library, will be briefly explained.

The system of classification in use in the library of the University of California is one devised by the librarian, Mr. J. C. Rowell; the scheme assigns numbers to the main divisions and numbers followed by one or more letters to the subdivisions, e. g., 305=Education, 305d=History of Education, 305dv=History of Education in the United States. The books are arranged alphabetically under the class number by means of the Cutter author number; this number is carried to three places in classes of any considerable size, while two places suffice for the smaller classes, such as subject bibliography. The simplest form of book number is like 305-B986 for Butler's Meaning of Education. Books by the same author, in the same class, are distinguished by using the initial letter of first word of the title, that is not an article, of the original language; transla-

tions are designated by initial letter of the language of the translation followed by initial letter of translator's name, e. g., 305-R864-eEw=Rousseau's *Emile* translated into English by Worthington. This mark might be called the work-mark to distinguish it from the author number. Copy numbers, dates of editions, and volume number are included in the book number and any book requiring all that information has a long and unwieldy call number, e. g., 19 F848 g 1900 v.3 cop.2= Volume 3 of the second copy, second edition, of Frazer's *Golden bough*.

Some authors, like Shakespeare and Cicero, have a special scheme of classification, so that the book number is comparatively simple. Biography is arranged by the Cutter number of the person who is the subject of the biography followed by the Cutter number of the biographer, e. g., 278-G543-M86=Morley's *Life of Gladstone*. Several classes are devoted to biography alone, here the initial letter of the biographer, instead of the Cutter number, is used, e. g., 305z-P719-m=Monroe's *Thomas Platter*. Local United States history is arranged by Cutter number of the place described followed by Cutter number of author, e. g., 176t-L77-C1=Calhoun's *Litchfield County Sketches*. The literature of educational institutions is kept together by the Cutter number for the name of the institution.

Sometimes a special scheme is required, for instance, many government publications are classed with their subject and as all have the Cutter number U 58, it often complicates the book number considerably, as one can judge when class 626 (Minor army tactics) contains publications of seven different departments, one of which, the War department, has twenty-five different titles or publications with various editions of some. To simplify this, the U 58 is followed by initial letter of the department issuing the publication, e. g., U 58n keeps together all the Navy department publications and a subletter is used as a work-mark for each publication of that department. Manuscripts are indicated by prefixing capital M to the

class number, and reading room books by prefixing the capital R.

As regards a few points in particular. Shall a library hold rigidly to the Cutter author number? It does not seem necessary in a small library nor in a large library with very close classification. When two or more books by the same author fall in the same class, give each as a book number the letter followed by three figures, of which only one number would be the true Cutter number. This is equivalent to letting the first two figures represent the author number and the third figure the work-mark. That would simplify the number and ordinarily be satisfactory, but, in some cases, it might make complications in assigning future members. Some librarians have adopted this to a certain extent and if they are represented here we would like to hear from them.

Size symbols seem quite desirable as an aid in locating oversize books, q to indicate all books between twenty-five and thirty centimeters and f all books over thirty centimeters high. If desired, the symbols q and f need not be used in lettering the backs of the books, but appear only on the catalog records and on the book-plate, prefixed to the author number. It would thus form a part of the call number and apparently serve every purpose intended.

Some libraries arrange books by first letter of title regardless of language, instead of by initial letter of original language, thus doing away with the capital letter to represent language and letter for translator's name. This would seem quite desirable in all classes with the exception of those for texts of literature where it is very desirable and helpful to have the texts of one work all grouped side by side.

Dates for editions can ordinarily be omitted by using the figures 2, 3, etc., after the work-mark for the second and third edition, e.g., Preston's *Theory of Heat*, 2 ed. would be 376 P 941t2 instead of 376 P941 t 1904. Where there are likely to be over nine editions of a work it is better to use dates.

As regards the position of the lower

case letter, which represents initial letter of title, some libraries place it on the same line directly after the Cutter number, as D55s, others place it underneath on another line, as D 55. The second arrangement provides for placing additional figures after the Cutter number if necessary, balances the call number more evenly when mark for translation or editions has to be added, and makes it more easily put on a thin book. Has any one had experience in using initial letter of binder's title, of a catch-title, or of a prominent word of the title instead of first word of title as it appears on the title page?

It seems desirable that a number scheme be used for book numbers so as to avoid the use of all letters except the letter for the author's name. It seems especially desirable when the class number contains a letter or letters, or when there are both capital and lower case letters in the call number; for it is hardly to be expected that the average person will very often copy such a call number correct in all details. The following scheme of work-marks for the writings of any author is designed for use in conjunction with the Cutter author number of two or three figures. The work-mark may be separated from the Cutter number by a period or a dash, but the simplest way is to let it follow as one number; since by using the shelf list in assigning future numbers, one can readily distinguish the author number from the work-mark.

The scheme has four main divisions for collected works, translations of collected works, single works and translations, and biography and criticism. 1 stands for editions of collected works, arranged chronologically, and 11 to 19 provides for nine editions; 19 may be reserved for selections. 2 stands for translations of collected works, arranged by language, 22=French, 23=German, 24=Italian, 25=Spanish, and 26 to 29=other languages. Thus the second figure always denotes language of translation and the addition of a third figure provides for nine translations under any one language. The numbers 30 to 89 stand for single works

arranged alphabetically, and they provide for sixty different titles; 1 to 8 added as a third figure provides for eight editions of any one title; 9 added as a third figure is reserved for translations, and with many translations a fourth figure corresponding to the language figure as given above is added. As a guide to alphabetical location, use the table for the division of the alphabet into ten parts, as devised by Mr. Cutter. (L.J. 3:250.) The number 9 stands for biography and criticism arranged alphabetically by author. One figure (0-9) after the 9 provides for ten titles and two figures for one hundred; the same table as heretofore mentioned will assist in alphabetical location. The following are samples of the numbers as applied to the works of Adam Smith:

315	}	Works, 3d edition.
S 642.13		
315	}	Works, German translation.
S 642.23		
315	}	Inquiry into the wealth of nations, 2d edition.
S 642.522		
315	}	Inquiry into the wealth of nations, French translation.
S 642.5292		
315	}	Hirst's Adam Smith.
S 642.937		

As all the numbers are used as decimals, the scheme permits of practically indefinite expansion, as the addition of one figure increases the capacity tenfold. In many cases the use of only one figure after the Cutter number is sufficient. The scheme shows the possibilities of numbers which are more legible and more accurately copied than any combination containing many letters.

The second paper was by J. E. GOODWIN, Leland Stanford Jr. university library, on

#### NECESSARY RED TAPE

Red Tape, as used in this paper, will mean to the librarian the ordinary methods for promoting regularity of practice in the various departments of the library; unfortunately, to the impatient professor, or member of the student body it too frequently means a succession of hurdles to be negotiated with all possible speed.

Practices, which may seem entirely obvious from the standpoint of the librarian, are often regarded with suspicion by faculty and students; and if perchance the method in question replaces one which has the local stamp of time upon it, the librarian may hear that the old system was much simpler and easier to understand.

The time element is very essential in the process of procuring books for a library, and especially is this true in the case of libraries that are situated outside the great centers of population, and consequently away from the large book supply houses. This time element often looms up as an annoyance to the professor.

Books, needed at once, are often either in Europe or at distances varying from the neighboring city to the width of the continent; and the professor who plans his course during the summer, or perchance during his sabbatical leave, and makes no provision for the checking of the resources in his home library until time for the opening of college and the meeting of his classes, will sometimes find that his plans for a semester are greatly disarranged, because the material he wishes his classes to use is not at hand. The desired authors may not be represented at all, or what more frequently happens, stress is placed upon references which the library has in inadequate numbers.

The buying of supplies for a university, including the books for the library, is now commonly managed through one office, so that it becomes impracticable, even if it might at times be desirable, for the librarian to take a professor's single order and send it to the publisher by next mail.

Faculty men occasionally discover books which they wish the librarian to buy for them on the counters of department stores. Their orders for these books may or may not have been sent in from the library to the regular agent, but it becomes necessary to explain why their orders should not at once be filled from the stock at the neighboring shop, and the order, if it has been placed with the regular dealer, cancelled. This practice could tend only to confusion in business records, while it would at the

same time add to the cost of the books; for an express or mail package costs more than a single item in a freight shipment.

Again, it is reasonably expected that the professor will furnish a list of the books he wants to buy for his department; a list sufficiently legible so that it can be read without spending hours in the process and exhausting the ingenuity and patience of the librarian.

A friend of mine, who had labored in vain to unravel items on one of these lists, finally appealed to the writer of the list who, after puzzling over the offending entries said, "Well, it is now some time since I wrote that, and I guess I will have to take it with me and see if I can remember what it was I intended to order." The professor is evidently still puzzling, at least those cards have never been returned.

We will assume that there is a definite and limited amount of money to be spent for books each year, and that the money is apportioned on a basis to meet equably, if not adequately, the needs of the several departments.

Most faculty men easily spend all their yearly allowance; indeed their problem is purely one of selection, for two books are commonly wanted where one can be purchased; an occasional man will have no idea in regard to what proportion of his fund he has used, and he would cheerfully continue to send in order cards, if he were not informed that his funds were all gone.

More rarely the man appears who for certain reasons is not interested in spending his annual allotment, and if there be a regulation providing that the fund be not allowed to accumulate until the next year, other members of the department will doubtless put in a plea for the privilege of spending the money rather than have it revert to the general library fund. However these details of apportionment and expenditure may be managed, the librarian must have his book account so readily accessible that there will be no danger of allowances being exceeded.

In the whole list of library processes, classification presents more reasonable and indeed more fruitful grounds for difference

of opinion between the librarian and the reader than any other.

"Why is this book placed here?"

"This book ought to be classified in the group I use in connection with this course in engineering."

"Really now, no one would ever think of looking for that book in any other connection than this."

These sentiments may be expressed in various ways and will depend for their force upon the temperament of the man whose sense of intellectual relationships has been offended by the grouping of the books. He may simply say, "Oh!" He may look at you with a superior and knowing smile and say nothing. This may mean that he is willing to concede your location for the book, or that the point will not, in his opinion, lend itself to discussion.

We do feel, however, that the man who is working on church history, and finds, for example, that he must collect his Luther material from three apparently equally important sections, before he goes into subsidiary sources at all, has just grounds for complaint. The classes 920, 838, and 270, so far as they apply to Luther, might well be united; for then the man who uses the catalog would be directed to the proper section, the man whose instinct directs him to the section used would find the bulk of the material available, and the man who found nothing in the place where he expected to find the material would undoubtedly be led to investigate; while if he found one of three or more equally important sections, he might conclude that any one of these represented the bulk of the library's resources on Luther.

But, whatever course is followed, the classifier will receive a protest sooner or later; for the history student who finds that Luther's works have an entirely literary environment, and the student in literature who must go to church history for his Luther, are going to make known their displeasure.

We can see but one solution for the difficulty so far as the professor is concerned, and that solution lies in his making a friend and confidant out of the card cata-

log; for as soon as the librarian has made the classification to square up with the ideas of a particular man, he is almost sure to have placed it on a bias with the ideas of another, and the latter may have the greater capacity for saying unpleasant things.

However, the card catalog is seldom consulted by the faculty man except when the book wanted is not found on the shelves where his preconceived notion would place it. And I conceive that in this point lies the foundation for the feeling in occasional men that the catalog and classification may ordinarily be depended upon to be a few points out of true.

There is trouble between the classification and the mind of the professor before he appeals to the index at all, so when this guide points in an unexpected direction, he questions its accuracy. He is used to piloting himself about the stack and giving no special thought to the classification so long as he finds the books where he expects; ordinarily, he has no use for the catalog. Hence, it follows that a really excellent catalog and good classification are made to appear very unsatisfactory to him, because in the large proportion of cases in which he uses the catalog he gets unexpected results.

When we have our books placed so that their positions are perfectly defensible, then we are justified, with a feeling of all the composure that is allowed us, to let our mental bias govern the situation. The work we do in changing records seems out of all proportion to what should be warranted; it takes more time to change the classification, cataloging and marking than it does to accomplish the processes in the first place. Perhaps the conditions for necessity of change in the records arise because we are too often led to classify for a special or temporary purpose when the book might better be given a number it could hold for all time.

Having said this, I do not wish to appear to be advocating the upholding of mistakes that may have been made, but simply to maintain that when classification is good, it must be shown that it can be made much

better before changes in the records involved are justifiable.

The practice of classifying copies of the same book in different sections of the library seems to me to defeat its own purpose, which purpose may be conceded to be to get the resources of the library into the hands of the reader in the shortest possible time and with a minimum expenditure of work. The assistant who handles a book which carries a copy number at once knows that he should be able to locate at least one more copy when the second call for the book comes; but if he has handed out a book with no copy number on it, and practice allows the regular classification of books in more than one place, he must appeal to the catalog for a check upon his work, otherwise he cannot be sure of his ground. The general practice of placing all copies of the same work in one place in the classification thus simplifies the amount of pure memory work required of the library assistant, and gets the book into the hands of the student more quickly, while it places upon the users of the library who have access to the stack a greater part of this necessity of supplementing their own efforts in locating books with help from the catalog.

A general plan of department libraries, unless it is conducted on a system of duplicating copies of books before they are transferred to departments, tends to remove from the main library many of our purely technical books and serial sets covering the fields represented. This system leaves for the main library the antiquated and obvious books in these subjects, but does not leave a really scholarly collection.

Many of these sets of books are brought to the attention of the main library only at the times when a volume is returned from the bindery, and sent over to be placed with the rest of the set; and many of the single volumes are so purely in the specialist's province that they are not called for from one year's end to the other. However, there are many cases where one copy of the book is really all that is necessary for the library to own, and the books can be temporarily transferred from

the department to the main collection. Nevertheless, there are desires which are effectively and forever quashed by the report that a book is in a department library. This condition may be set down as representing a deplorable state of indifference on the part of the student; but looked upon in the most favorable light, the fact that the book is not at hand is an obstacle, especially to the student who is not interested in the department where the book is lodged.

One of the most fruitful sources of annoyance for the student, and a real obstacle in his access to the books, is the professor who keeps just far enough ahead of his class, in preparing his lectures, to draw out the books on his personal account, before assignments for reading are announced or syllabus sheets distributed.

We can always look with a degree of sympathy upon the young instructor who has to build up his lectures from week to week as he carries his class along; he has not really found himself, as yet, in the realm of the professor, and has accumulated but a fraction of his authorities in his private library. Yet, however sympathetic we may feel for this instructor, and knowing full well that he cannot support himself, and buy all the books he needs on a thousand dollars a year, the fact yet remains that students are often put days behind in their reading and the librarian left to turn away call after call, on the part of these students, while he diplomatically suggests to the instructor that he has in his possession some books to which he has referred his students and for which there is constant clamor on the far side of the loan desk.

This condition is not always limited to instructors; there is an occasional professor who manages his classes in the same way. The annoyance from this source manifests itself in varying degrees; it takes on a semi-tragic aspect when there is a single copy of the book, or when the time of accounting on the part of the students draws near and the supply of books to meet the demand is short.

It sometimes happens that the student

really has no use for the book and a mere glance inside it would satisfy him; but the fact that the instructor considers the book of sufficient importance to occupy his attention makes the student feel that it must contain the basic principles of the whole subject; and so the conscientious student is troubled until he has a chance to see for himself what there is in the book.

With many instructors, the annoyance from this source is purely a negligible quantity and the librarian finds not only that the materials for class use are in their places when the demand for them commences, but he is often notified that certain material will be needed at a given time. When the librarian is not warned by the well-timed syllabus, or a word from the professor, the students who get their reading done early, of whom there are always a few, may withdraw the important books from the library; and when the big demand comes, we must wait upon a postal or telephone message before we can get the books into active use again.

There is another source of friction for the library when books, which are not represented in the catalog and which upon investigation are found never to have been in the library, are referred to or appear upon syllabus sheets. This condition of affairs obtains when a professor has been arranging a new course or working over an old one, and neglects to check his sources in the home catalog for citations gathered in other libraries.

References sometimes appear, which to the student mean absolutely nothing, and which, to the librarian, mean that someone has blundered. These come about in one of several ways—the reference may be to an analytic which the assistant will not recognize on sight, as he has failed to fix in his memory all the entries in the card catalog together with references in Poole, and other periodical indexes. Sometimes an elaborate syllabus is handed to the students in which publishers, dates and prices of books are given; then we get such call slips as this presented: "Heath and Co., 1898." The student will then probably look

at you in surprise when he is told that the information he is furnishing tells absolutely nothing from which we can identify the book wanted. Of course the student, in a case like this, has perversely selected the strictly non-essential part of the entry and excluded the essentials—namely the author and title. Or the student may ask for "Jones," or for "The Inquisition," and, if there is no author of this name especially in the limelight at the given time, or if no particular edition of "The Inquisition" is being commonly used, the attendant must insist that the request be made more specific.

You may now be ready to raise the query as to why call numbers are not always required, and this is as good a place as any for its discussion. An assistant who must depend upon call numbers is of very little use when it comes to the hour of stress, when he has a hand full of cards for books which he must collect and knows that the number of demands awaiting his attention, in a short time, will be limited only by his ability to handle them. If he does not know the classification and outward appearance of the books, it will take him at least a third longer to collect them. But having familiarized himself with the books that are used throughout the year and those used at the same relative time in succeeding years, the attendant is still forced to call upon the student to use the catalog and procure call numbers for part of his books.

Many students will go without a book before they will make this small effort to help themselves; or they will get around the difficulty by holding the card in question until a more experienced attendant comes to the desk, when they will present the card to him and see, if by chance, they can get the book. When possible these students should be made to produce the numbers. Theoretically, every call slip presented at the desk for a book should carry the call number; practically, this is entirely superfluous, and both the library and the student lose time if it is insisted upon. The problem then is to keep the



student in a frame of mind where he will produce numbers cheerfully, when they are needed, and not burden him with them when they are not.

Finally: How can we impose a system of penalties for infringement of rules, without spending too much time in the processes involved? Some system of regulation is imperative, and whatever the system may be, it will sometimes present unpleasant personal features in its administration; these we must expect.

Suppose we have instituted a system of fines. Can we reduce the process of collecting them to a simpler basis than the one outlined in the following plan? Each student, when he presents himself at the library wishing to withdraw a book signs a guarantee card. This card states that the student agrees to abide by the rules of the library, and make good fines and losses incurred by him. These cards are renewed each year on the return of the student to college, and are filed alphabetically. When a fine is incurred a statement is sent to the student, the guarantee card is taken from the file and the facts involved noted on the back with the amount of the fine due. When the fine is paid, its receipt is entered on the back of the guarantee card, and the card refilled in its place in the guarantee register. This gives data on students who are regular offenders, and enables the library readily to tell whether there has been a response to its statement.

Where no system of readers' cards for drawing books from the library is in use, the penalty of depriving an offender of the privileges of the library cannot be imposed, since there is sure to be an obliging "friend" who will secure the books, and, save for causing a little inconvenience, the penalty proves a farce.

The whole penalty system should be conducted so that the offender is made to square accounts, and the discipline secured is sufficient to compensate for the time and effort expended.

W. E. HENRY, librarian of the University of Washington library, read the last paper of the session, on the subject

#### THE ACADEMIC STANDING OF COLLEGE LIBRARY ASSISTANTS AND THEIR RELATION TO THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION

In taking up this topic for consideration we must realize that we are dealing with a new profession in educational work, that this profession is an outgrowth of new conceptions in educational materials and processes and that the terms and conditions are fixed by these materials and processes. We must, therefore, treat briefly certain origins before coming specifically to the apparent topic.

This new relationship expressed in the words "college library assistant" came upon us unawares as a part of recent evolution in the conceptions of education—new conceptions of studentship and scholarship.

This new learning of less than fifty years is characterized by broad scope, searching investigation, infinite detail, first hand authority and such variety as would have been bewildering a few years earlier. The old learning wrote the natural history of the world from Adam; the new learning writes volumes on bacteriology, and the new library is as unlike the old as the books they contain. They present precisely the same differences.

The type of student that uses books and in turn produces them is less than half a century old. The mass of books that constitute the working collection of most American college libraries have been written since the American library association held its first session in 1876. The "new learning" covers the half century after 1860. In 1876 there were but three college libraries in America that contained more than 45,000 volumes each; only one possessed more than 100,000 volumes. Very few professors placed Ph.D. after their names in the college catalog, and this growth of these two facts since then may be traced side by side as interchanging cause and effect—a new studentship and a new library. The new learning demanded detailed information "ready to serve hot," therefore a new well-organized library.

The new library is a hundred times more varied than the old. The more varied library has the greater variety of function and demands more perfect organization as in all forms of organic life. This higher type and more complex organization originates the demand for the modern library assistant, and fixes the condition in education and training.

In the old college library there were relatively few subjects, few authors, few investigations, few readers, few demands of any kind. The new learning fixed the standards for the new profession. Breadth of scholarship, detail of information, cosmopolitan and comprehensive, were demanded, and all of it ready on call. Compare the college curriculum of 1876 with that of the present. The librarian in the old college library becomes the staff in the new; one becomes many, and the college library assistant comes into being.

In the older pedagogy the teacher did mere textbook recitation work or occasionally did worse by lecturing, but there was almost no thought of bibliographical work in connection with the recitation assignments. He needed no library service, hence no library nor librarian. The new pedagogy values the work done in the library as quite as vital and more informing than that of the class room. No subject is well treated now until a fair bibliography of the subject is mastered. Here the librarian is quite as necessary as the teacher and quite as helpful. Neither could do his work without the other. Co-operation has become a necessity, and the preparation of the two is essentially similar, in slightly different directions, but complementary. The library staff must be the equals in scholarship and preparation of the faculty of any one academic department, and if it is not so the library will fall short of the work that ought to be done in coöperative education.

The reference librarian must needs possess a larger grasp of information than is expected of any professor, for this member of the staff must know in general all that all the faculty knows in detail. The lending librarian, if she does her whole duty,

must know the book resources as well as the combined faculty knows them. It has been said that the girl who can measure ribbon over the counter at three dollars per week can hand out books at the same price. My own belief is that the readiest and best informed mind as well as the best business head in the staff is none too good for the loan desk, and the work of other departments could be shown relatively as important in the particular fields.

The member of the faculty obtains his rank in part because of his academic preparation, and in part because he has to do with directing the education of others. His work in the education of others is sometimes in the actual processes of teaching, —the hearing of recitations, lecturing, directing the reading, or it may be largely in mere administrative work. This rank, so far as it depends upon academic preparation is usually indicated by a degree granted from some institution. This degree means that he has completed a certain course of instruction but does not indicate that he can do any particular kind or grade of service. In short, his rank is evidence of scholarly relationship. Measured by these tests, which I believe to be fair, the members of the library staff bear a very similar relation to educational activities. We do not think of a college library assistant coming to his position on the staff on any other basis than one of general scholarship, and not usually without some special training for the work he assumes, either in a library training school or valuable experience in a well-managed library. The professor has not usually a training for his work as a teacher, however much he may have in scholarship. The library assistant is not usually a teacher in the sense of a hearer of recitations or a formal lecturer, yet anyone who knows his real work must admit that it is frequently as personal and quite as scholastically helpful as that done by the teacher. If this equality does not exist then the staff should be revised. With such preparation and such relationship to the educational processes I shall claim that the library staff must rank with the

faculty or teaching staff of any department. The librarian or head of the staff should have the rank and pay of a professor; the assistant librarian, if such a title for a distinct position exists, should be accorded the rank and pay of an associate professor; and the other members of the staff that of assistant professor or instructor, this to be determined by the nature of the work, the preparation and particular ability required; and those not fitted to so rank should not be members of the staff but some other name should be adopted.

I am sure that this doctrine will sound a bit revolutionary and somewhat like the closed shop to persons who have been accustomed to think of the library staff along with janitors and scrubwomen, but to me librarianship is a learned profession and in college must rank with the teaching profession. As before defined, I do not include in the library staff mere student assistants uneducated and untrained persons in the most subordinate position. The staff must be respected as educators by the faculty, not merely for the satisfaction of the staff but for the good of the library in its power for efficiency.

It would have been infinitely more fortunate for colleges in their library administration if instead of the word "librarian" the title Professor of books and reading had been substituted as suggested in the "Special report on public libraries" in 1876. Mr. Perkins in that report emphasizes the doctrine that the office of librarian shall be "a professorship teaching method," not subject; how to discover, not what to discover. Mr. Matthews in the same report, bore upon the thesis that the college should provide "a professor to assist the student." These men back in the early age of modern librarianship outlined precisely the duty of a modern college library staff—to assist the student in the method of discovery. Each member of a well organized staff holds a professorship or an instructorship in the department of books and reading.

As I have thought over the peculiar mission of each member of the staff I am per-

suaded that each is vitally essential to the work of the professorship of books and reading. The person who selects the book, the one who catalogs it, is just as vitally, though less directly, helping the student as is the one who hands him the book with the page designated.

Then, in the department of books and reading we have precisely the relationship and must demand the scholarship and specific training as is demanded in the departments of history, English, German, or engineering. The library staff must rank with the teaching staff of a given department, for the instructor and guide in method of scholarship bears the same vital relation to the education of the student as does the guide in matters of scholarship.

For comparative relations the term "Professor of books and reading" is much more significant than "Librarian," for the latter term has brought with it the suggestion of the inactive police relation of a keeper of books, while the former has in it the implication of active help—of progressive educational purpose. I do not mean that it would be wise to change the name of this office in the college catalog, but I use it here with the hope that I may make the relationship clearer and thereby place the library staff where I think it belongs in educational economy.

Whatever may be said of individual persons or positions as to requirement it is clear that so far there exists no uniformity of appreciation or organization within the college library staff. We are not agreed among ourselves as to how many and what departments naturally and logically exist, and the term "Head of the Department" has a great variety of indefinite meanings. There is likewise no defined notion as to the essential requirements for heads of certain departments, there is neither uniformity nor consistency of names for college library assistants; and finally there is no fixed conception as to just what constitutes a library staff. Does staff include only heads of departments with the librarian, or does it include assistants in the departments as well as student assistants or even pages? These

questions must be answered and the nomenclature fixed before the questions of this paper can be fully and satisfactorily answered. We shall not be ranked outside of the staff until we rank within it. If, however, we desire and expect the library staff to rank with the teaching staff of a department we must demand academic and professional preparation and a kind and quality of work that will command respect from the faculty and from others having knowledge of college rank and standing. Their work must be professional and educational.

Admission to the staff of a college library must demand at least the bachelor's degree and added thereto should be the training of a library school preferably culminating in a professional degree; or, in lieu of school training, such experience in library work as shall leave no question of capacity or efficiency.

It is true that in a large staff there is much petty detail that, for economic reasons, well prepared people cannot afford to perform. A considerable per cent of any large staff will be composed of lower grade relatively untrained persons who cannot and ought not attain to faculty rank. These I should not consider as members of the staff but should provide some other title such as helper or attendant, and let that title become definite and fixed.

Let us make our staff a very specific and very exclusive body clearly defined in the minds of all having official relation to the institution. Let the line be distinctly drawn but not snobbishly maintained. Let us classify closely on the basis of preparation and demonstrated efficiency and then be exacting in our nomenclature. I have pointed out upon purely historical and theoretical grounds what should be the academic rank of the college library assistant. I shall briefly state the theory of this same assistant's relation to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and follow up this theoretical statement with a few facts as to what conditions do actually prevail with regard to both of these questions in a dozen repre-

sentative institutions in all parts of the country.

Whatever reasons may have prevailed for admitting teachers in any college or university faculty to retiring allowances from the Carnegie Foundation are equally valid when applied to the library staff, not perhaps as it is now constituted in many cases, but as above defined. If present affluence be the measure then I am sure the librarian has equal claim with the professor. If the insufficiency of salary either in fact or in prospect be taken in evidence then I am sure no professor could urge a stronger claim than can the library assistant. If a long and faithful service be a condition, then the library staff must stand side by side with the professor inviting the generosity of the Foundation. If singleness of purpose and devoted service be the test then the library assistant admits no superior. If scholarly requirements and extensive preparation are to be considered evidence of fitness there is no difference. As valiant and efficient helpers in the process and progress of higher education I know of no claim that will admit one to the privileges of the Foundation and deny the same to the other.

From any point of view I cannot see a single argument that will admit the assistant professor and the instructor to participate in the foundation that will deny the library assistant when the library staff shall be composed on as high standards of efficiency as the teaching staff. It then becomes the business of the college librarians to define carefully, through the executive authorities of the colleges, the library staff and the qualifications demanded, and to see to it that only such persons are admitted.

What conditions now prevail in college libraries? In preparing this paper I tried to collect facts from college and university libraries covering the entire country from east to west, including both state and endowed institutions. From seventeen inquiries I had sixteen replies for which I sincerely thank the responding libraries. Only about 43 per cent of those persons now holding positions as college library as-

sistants hold even baccalaureate degrees. About 20 per cent have had some library school training, a considerable proportion of these hold the B. L. S. degree.

As to faculty rank it appears that the librarian usually has the rank of a professor. Below the librarian all sorts of conditions prevail. In one instance all members of the staff are considered members of the faculty, yet less than half of them have any degree. The reference librarian ranks as instructor, and all below him rank with the lowest grade of the teaching force. I do not find what that rank is. Below the librarian and a first assistant there seems to be no faculty rank in most cases. With the above figures as to preparation it is not at all surprising that most assistants have no rank.

As to the relation to the Carnegie Foundation, usually the librarian and assistant seem to be eligible to a retiring allowance, as these usually have some professional rank. However, the term "assistant librarian" is used without discrimination. In some instances it means a specific rank next the head of the staff, but in quite a number of cases it seems to apply to almost any person working in the library. The library assistant is so far scarcely considered.

For reasons of internal organization and external respect and proper standing, I am convinced we must standardize our college libraries just as the colleges and universities are being standardized under the guiding and commanding influence of the Carnegie Foundation. I wish that some one would recommend that a committee from this organization might be appointed to take up the work of standardizing the college library force, and make recommendations as to staff organizations, qualifications of members of the staff and nomenclature that some time in the future we may have a common language.

I can bring to you at this time three guiding facts for our future action; the ruling of the Foundation itself and the action of two of our leading universities—Columbia and Harvard. That portion of rule five of the Carnegie Foundation which

provides for librarians participating in the retiring allowance reads as follows: "Librarians, registrars, recorders, and administrative officers of long tenure whose salaries may be classed with those of professors are considered eligible to the benefits of a retiring allowance." Now, whether *librarian* means head of the staff only, or whether it means a number of persons doing the higher quality of library work may be questioned since some assistants in libraries have been granted allowances. Yet in a letter from the secretary of the Foundation under date of April 1, 1911, this sentence occurs, "Ordinarily we have not considered that assistant librarians might count their service toward a retiring allowance," yet later in the same letter this writer makes the possible exception of such large libraries as Columbia and Harvard.

The Harvard rules for retiring allowances specify that "librarians and assistant librarians" are covered by the provision. Assistant librarian at Harvard is not a specific single position but applies to two persons of equal rank.

The Columbia university trustees on February 6 of this year provided as follows: "The librarian shall have the rank of professor, the assistant librarian that of associate professor and the supervisors (with grade of assistant librarian) shall rank as assistant professors and bibliographers as instructors." The action of these two great leading universities is so specific and well defined and apparently so just I quote from them as a guide which the rest of us may follow if even at some distance.

On motion of Mr. Lane it was voted that separates of Mr. Henry's paper be printed by the Secretary of the A. L. A. and sent to all of the college and university libraries in the United States.

Mr. W. C. Lane spoke of the meeting of the Association of New England libraries, held at Wellesley recently, where the question of inter-library loans was discussed. He spoke of the time and labor involved in sending out books and in checking up lists for books both in the library

and those **not** in the library. The advisability of charging a small fee was considered, the fee being not for the use of the book but simply to cover in some degree the cost of the extra labor involved. The payment of a fee would perhaps insure greater freedom in asking for inter-

library loans. Discussion by Messrs. Andrews, Henry, Lane, Leupp and Miss M. L. Jones.

On motion of Mr. Andrews it was voted that the matter of the purposes, principles and methods of inter-library loans be referred to the Committee on Co-ordination.

## SECTION ON PROFESSIONAL TRAINING FOR LIBRARIANSHIP

The annual meeting of the Professional training section was held on Wednesday, May 24, and was largely attended. In the absence of the chairman, P. L. Windsor, Chalmers Hadley of the Denver public library presided, and Miss Charlotte Elizabeth Wallace of the Seattle public library acted as secretary.

The program for the meeting was as follows:

Library training in California—Mary L. Sutliff, California state library.

Discussion—L. W. Ripley, Sacramento public library and W. R. Watson, San Francisco public library.

The theory of the training school in the large library system—Faith E. Smith, Chicago public library.

Discussion—Arthur E. Bostwick and Paul Blackwelder, St. Louis public library.

Miss MARY L. SUTLIFF opened the program with a paper on

"adopted as possibly affording a solution" of the difficulty arising from the too familiar combination of low funds and an overburdened staff.

So successful did the experiment prove that other classes followed in quick succession. At first no formal class work was given, the pupils gaining their knowledge from their work in the various departments. Beginning, however, with the third class, June, 1892, a regular course of instruction was given.

This course of study was outlined in the Library journal, v. 17, and afterward amplified by Miss Hasse in her articles on "The training of library employees" (Lib. jour. '20). After the lapse of twenty years one reads with admiration the description of this thorough, systematic and well-planned course. Undoubtedly much of the future success of the training class was due to the excellent foundation laid by Miss Kelso and Miss Hasse.

One feature of the training of these early classes seems especially worthy of consideration to-day. Pupils passing an examination at the end of the first six months were given employment in the library on partial time while their training was continued for another six months, the more difficult technical points being taken up. A final successful examination was followed by employment on full time. Somewhat too much of examination here perhaps, and the added six months must have imposed a heavy burden upon the teaching staff, but there can be no doubt of the benefit to the class of this prolonged period of instruction.

### LIBRARY TRAINING IN CALIFORNIA

The first library training in California of which we have any record was that given in the training class of the Los Angeles public library. The first class of six members began work under the direction of Miss Kelso, the librarian, in November, 1891. The pupils were required to pass an entrance examination and agreed to give to the library three hours service daily for six months, at the end of which time they were, upon passing an examination, placed upon the substitute list of the library. The board of library directors announced frankly that the class was an experiment,